UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,775	09/28/2001	David Tarrant	20-974	3002

7590	03/21/2005

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
7th Floor
2000 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-3307

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 December 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

        1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 6 are presented for examination.

Specification

2.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Summary of the

Invention is not properly described, See MPEP § 608.01(d)

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 1 and 3 are objected to because of the following informalities:

      I.   "LDAP" on line 12 needs to be spelled out.

      II.   "module c)" online 17 of claim 1 and line 1 of claim 3.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it

fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. This claim is an omnibus

type claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1, 2, 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al.

[US Patent No 6,182,142], in view of Dutcher et al. [US Patent No 6,209,032].

7.   As per claim 1, Win discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a system

for managing a computer network having a multiplicity of users, applications programs and

servers, the system comprising

user interface means for displaying a list of tasks appropriate to a given user at a given

time [Figures 10A-C; and col 19, lines 35-52], said user interface means capable of

exchanging data with the computer network [Abstract; and col 1, lines 31-33],

administration [114, Figure 1] means comprising a software object including a set of

rules defining the relationships between users, applications programs and servers [col 5, lines

29-46], said administration means capable of exchanging data with the computer network and

with the user interface means [col 6, lines 34-38; and col 7, lines 52-65],

a module comprising database means and one or more LDAP compliant directories for

storing user records and/or application program records and/or server records [col 12, lines 55-

67; and col 17, lines 19-21], to enable updating of said records in a systematic way [i.e.

synchronize] [col 21, lines 3-5], and

the system being adapted and arranged to enable users to cause or permit said

administration means to perform one or more tasks from the group consisting of: user record

creation; user record updating; user record deletion; application program installation;

application program commissioning; application program updating; changing application

program location; application program deletion; server commissioning, server updating;

server removal [col 13, lines 1-54].

Win does not specifically disclose

synchronisation means for managing and synchronising the exchange of data between

said administration means, module c), and the computer network,

Dutcher discloses

synchronisation means for managing and synchronising the exchange of data between

said administration means, module c), and the computer network [Figures 8-13; Abstract; col 2,

lines 33-49; and col 9, lines 64-col 10, lines 5].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the teaching of Win and Dutcher because Dutcher's teaching of synchronization

would allow maintain up to date information to keep its data integrity.

8.   As per claim 2, Win discloses which the set of rules is stored as a set of objects in an

object-oriented environment [i.e. Java, C/C++] [col 7, lines 14-22].

9.   As per claim 4, Win does not specifically disclose which the synchronization means

includes a databus. Dutcher discloses which the synchronisation means includes a databus [col

4, lines 9-12]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Win and Dutcher because Dutcher's teaching of databus

would allow information to communicate between devices internally as well as externally in a

consistent manner.

10.   As per claim 5, Win discloses which there are a plurality of classes of user, each class

having a respective set of appropriate tasks [col 20, lines 55-col 21, lines 5].

11.   As per claim 6, Win discloses which the user record comprises a number of data fields, as

specified in Appendix A and B [col 20, lines 65-col 21, lines 5; and col 21 lines 13-16].

12.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al. [US

Patent No 6,182,142], in view of Dutcher et al. [US Patent No 6,209,032], and further in view

of Gullotta et al. [US Patent Application No 2002/0156904].

13.   As per claim 3, Win and Dutcher do not specifically disclose which module c) consists of a meta-directory. Gullotta discloses which module c) consists of a meta-directory [paragraph 0082]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Win, Dutcher and Gullotta because Gullotta's teaching of meta-directory would allow only meta-data to be communicated between devices which would reduce network traffic and prevent network congestion.

0.   A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached at (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2154

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100